

This is one of 40-some presentations I have given on the Senate floor, and I will keep doing this as long as I stay in the Senate because our people need to know and put pressure on their representatives. They need to think about this so the next person they elect to walk into the White House will hopefully have the courage to address our fiscal problems in a way that is not going to put our next generation in such dire situations.

With that, I add to our ever-growing list of waste, fraud, and abuse another \$486 million for a total of \$162,764,055,817. Think how that money could be used for essential items like Zika, Ebola, research at the National Institutes of Health, education, paving roads, doing infrastructure repairs—any number of things that need to be done, which is how that money could be better used than selling used airplane scrap for 6 cents a pound. Think about the money that could be returned to the taxpayers that they wouldn't have to pay in taxes if we could simply run a much more efficient, effective government.

Spending is a huge issue. It needs to be addressed in this election. The American people need to be aware of where we stand. Where we stand today is substantially worse than when I arrived to start my second term in the Senate 5½ years ago.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2028, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Alexander/Feinstein amendment No. 3801, in the nature of a substitute.

Alexander (for Flake/McCain) amendment No. 3876 (to amendment No. 3801), to require that certain funds are used for the review and revision of certain operational documents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, today I want to talk about the Obama administration's nuclear agreement with Iran and the many ways the agreement has failed to rein in Iranian hostile behavior over the course of the last year.

Over the last week, I thought it was interesting that there was great reluctance on the part of people who voted in an enabling way to allow the Iranian agreement to occur to take a stand on the position that Mr. COTTON brought to the Senate floor, where we would not now give Iran millions of dollars to purchase heavy water that they would use in their nuclear activities and obviously continue to produce.

In addition to that, I saw on Monday of this week that Iran tested a variant missile with a range of over 2,000 kilometers capable of striking Israel. Over and over again, we see Iran participating in hostile behavior and, somehow, none of that behavior violates either the spirit or the 'letter of the agreement that was discussed as such an important breakthrough with what was going to happen in Iran.

For those of us who predicted that Iran's behavior would not change and that behavior in the neighborhood would change in fear of what would happen because of Iran—I think those predictions are becoming more and more obviously true.

On April 2, 2015, a framework agreement was reached on that program. Here we are a year later. This agreement seems not to have accomplished any of the things that we would want to accomplish with the country of Iran.

According to President Obama: "Iran so far has followed the letter of the agreement, but the spirit of the agreement involves Iran also sending signals to the world community and businesses that it is not going to be engaging in a range of provocative actions that might scare business off."

That is an absolute quote from the President.

Now, why we are concerned about scaring business off from Iran, I don't know, because another quote from the administration over and over again is that Iran is the No. 1 state sponsor of terrorism. I think if we were talking more about that activity of Iran and less about what they need to encourage business activities, we would be doing what we should be doing.

Jennifer Rubin wrote in the Washington Post that "his comments are curious both because the 'letter of the agreement' seems to be forever changing to incorporate Iran's demands and because despite Iran's actions, the president continues to make more and more concessions."

The administration sold this deal on the promise that we would see a great change in behavior. Take, for example,

the behavior that has occurred: Iran's continued disregard of the United Nations Security Council resolutions dealing with ballistic missiles. Since the conclusion of the nuclear deal last summer, Iran has test-fired new classes of missiles whenever it wanted to; as I just mentioned, as late as last Monday. In October, they tested new missiles that are precision guided and more sophisticated than the current missiles they have. They have now tested missiles that could reach Israel.

Despite the U.N. Security Council explicitly calling for Iran to halt its ballistic missile activity, Iran's leaders have consistently rebuffed anything that is coming from the international community that it says is out of bounds of the resolution, and apparently everything is out of bounds of the resolution. In August of 2015, the deputy foreign minister of Iran and chief nuclear negotiator told the Tehran Times: "The restrictions on weapons posed through Resolution 2231 . . . are not mandatory and we can disregard them."

That statement directly contradicts Secretary of State Kerry's statement when he talked about the resolution. When he testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last July, on July 23, Secretary Kerry said:

They are restrained from any sharing of missile technology, purchase of missile technology, exchange of missile technology work on missiles. They cannot do that under Article 41, which is Chapter 7 and mandatory. . . .

Obviously the administration has a much different interpretation of the current U.N. resolutions than Iran, but they also appear to have a completely flexible interpretation of what the agreement actually says.

In March of this year—just a few weeks ago—the Department of Justice unsealed an indictment of Iranians who carried out cyber attacks against critical infrastructure and the financial sector of the United States with the knowledge of the Iranian Government. What does critical infrastructure mean? Critical infrastructure means the utilities, the transportation network, the things we have to rely on every day to provide the infrastructure the country needs to function.

The indictment notes that one of the hackers "received credit for his computer intrusion work from the Iranian government toward completion of his mandatory military service in Iran."

I don't know any other way to interpret that than to say that if someone is in the Iranian military and if they want to cyber attack the United States, they will give someone credit for military service time to do that.

I would think the administration would consider applying sanctions to put more pressure on Iran and not worry quite so much about Iran's future business opportunities. Curiously, yet predictably, the administration has